been trying to see if our coffee can be cured better so as to command better prices.

MR. M. A. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR.—The Marketing Expert of the Government of India visited the State recently. What is the outcome of the Government's consultation with him?

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL.—It is as a result of the discussions with him that the entire matter is under the active consideration of Government.

MR. M. A. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR.—Is it under contemplation to appoint a Marketing Officer for Mysore?

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL.—That aspect of the question is also under consideration.

MR. M. A. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR.—Do the Mysore Government want to proceed, in respect of that question, on the lines laid down in the Government of India Resolution?

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL.—I can only say that the whole matter is under consideration.

MR. M. A. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR.—May we hope that very soon some substantial advance will be made in that direction?

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL.—Yes.

The Mysore Road Traffic and Taxes Bill—*Resumed.*

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY observed that the Bill related only to two main principles, *viz.*, the constitution of a Traffic Board and revised taxation. As regards the first, the House was generally in favour; but as regards the second, there were many details not mentioned in the statement of general principles, on account of which the House was not in a position adequately to judge the utility of the proposed legislation and ascertain how far it was an improvement over the existing Regulation. The Traffic Board would no doubt, consist of a certain amount of non-official element and certain special interests would also be represented on it; but it was not clear what the exact number of non-officials on the Board was going to be, what proportion that number would bear to the number of official members and what powers the Board as a whole was going to exercise. He would specifically suggest that bus passengers who were subjected to a number of difficulties at present be represented on the Board.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the interests to be represented had been mentioned only in general and that there was nothing to prevent Government considering that suggestion.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY, while thanking the Government for the reply, observed that it only went to support the contention of Mr. Hoskoppa Krishna Rao who had urged that for this and other reasons the Government might take some more time over the Bill, make it self-contained and place it before the Assembly at its next session.

Referring to the question of the constitution of the Traffic Board, he said that one would like to know before lending support or offering opposition to the Bill whether the Board would consist of an adequate number of representatives from District Boards whose interests were going to be vitally affected by the proposed legislation.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL feared that if, as suggested, representatives from each District Board were to be taken, the Traffic Board, would become an unwieldy and unworkable body. Each member would begin to advance the interests of his own district so that the Central Traffic Board would become practically another District Board. For this reason, he said that there was no idea to give representation to District Boards as such. The Central Traffic Board must view the questions coming before it from the point of view of the interests of the State as a whole.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY said that in that case he would have to hold back even the partial support which he had originally intended to give to the Bill. For, in the circumstances, the District Boards were sure to be adversely affected by the constitution of the Traffic Board. In the first place,

all the income they were deriving from tolls would be definitely taken away from them and, in the second place, all the powers they were exercising would also be denied to them in future. These two reasons certainly demanded that District Boards must be duly represented on the Traffic Board. He agreed with the First Member of Council that members might be inclined to advance the interests of their particular local bodies. To prevent that, he would suggest that all the District Boards and all the Municipalities need not be represented on the Board but only select representatives who might be expected to view the question from the point of view of local self-government institutions of the State as a whole.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that even under that suggestion the Traffic Board would become unwieldy. After all the local boards need have no misgivings about the work of the Traffic Board so long as definite principles with regard to apportionment of revenue and such other questions in which the boards would be interested were specifically laid down in the Regulation.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY said that even if the general principles were laid down by law, a number of occasions would arise for difference of opinion with regard to the interpretation of such principles.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that in such cases, the Traffic Board would certainly consult the local bodies concerned. Such an arrangement would be better than having on the Board particular members who might view the questions coming up for decision with special favour or disfavour.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY asked what particular objection Government had to including representatives of the several District Boards. In Madras, for instance, he said that the entire bus traffic was under the control of the District Boards.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that what the Government in Mysore were proposing to do was to constitute a central organization instead. In all progressive countries they had central ministries of transport. The proposed Central Traffic Board was not going to concern itself about questions like allocation as between one particular local board and another. Probably, that would be done by Government themselves in accordance with specific principles laid down in advance.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY observed that if all the general principles were going to be laid down specifically and everything else became an easy matter, including questions like apportionment of revenue, it might be quite unnecessary to have an elaborate organization like the proposed Central Board. His own opinion was that the question was not so easy as that. However clearly the law specified the principles governing the actions and decisions of the Central Traffic Board, questions were bound to arise on which exchange of opinions, discussions and mutual adjustment would become necessary. It was to secure all these that he was suggesting the inclusion of District Board representatives. If, as the First Member was pleased to say, the whole thing was going to be mechanised, one single officer of Government might as well serve the purpose which the Central Traffic Board was meant to serve. This, he said, was a question on which the District Boards were not going to be satisfied with the answers given. The speaker contended that they were entitled to representation on the Board and unless this point was conceded, the House would not be prepared to support the proposed measure.

Proceeding to the question of taxation, MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY said that in all measures of taxation, it was usual for the legislature to specify the particular rates that were going to be levied. In the present case, however, the Government had specified only the maximum rates and not the rates that were actually going to be charged. He was however glad that the committee had acknowledged that their recommendations were far from ideal and he

thought that the recommendation in respect of taxation was an instance in point.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL invited the attention of the speaker to the existence of a provision in respect of maximum rates in the Municipal Regulations and observed that the inclusion of such rates in legislation was therefore not a new principle.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY argued that he was equally opposed to that provision in the Municipal Regulations on principle. The proposed legislation sought to levy the same rate of taxation on a given type of vehicles throughout the State, without regard to local conditions. For example, the area that could be covered by a motor bus or taxi in a big city like Bangalore was certainly more than the area in a town or minor municipality, so that simply because the same type of vehicles was being used in both the places, there was no justice in levying the same rate of tax in both those places.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL reminded the speaker that even though the areas of particular cities or towns differed, there was nothing to prevent the motor vehicles in particular municipalities from running over roads belonging to other municipalities.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY pointed out that that could only be possible by paying toll at a number of places.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that all the same it would not be correct to say that vehicles belonging to particular areas could not run over other areas.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY, however, stressed the point that vehicles in bigger cities or towns could traverse longer distances without having to pay for a second time, and therefore the proposed system of uniformity of taxation was not sustainable. For this reason, he advocated the adoption of a principle of graded taxation of motor vehicles in different towns and cities.

As regards the proposed taxation of buses according to seating capacity, he was not aware on what basis this particular provision had been made. If at all, this method of taxation was favourable only to buses meant for long distance traffic. Unfortunately, however, in the Mysore State, such services were few and perhaps would become fewer still in future. So the proposed mode of taxation was going to hit the short distance services. And in addition to the point stressed by Mr. Bhashyam, he would say that this kind of taxation was going to act as a very great hardship in the case of smaller capitalists and this would go to add to the inconveniences of passengers also. He would therefore suggest that the principle of taxing with reference to seating capacity be altogether done away with by adopting, instead, the mileage cess as in the Madras Presidency.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the principle of levying mileage cess was not in vogue throughout the Madras Presidency. It might be that a few District Boards had adopted it. But even in such cases, it was not a question of mileage cess as opposed to the tax on the basis of seating capacity. In every case, it was a question of combination of both.

With regard to the railway competition roads, MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY objected to the proposed reduction of rates, not because reduction was not called for but because the benefit of it would go only to railway organizations, at any rate wherever such organizations availed themselves of the concession of monopoly conceded in the proposed law; and to that extent the District Boards concerned were sure to lose. He believed that railway competition roads fell mostly within the jurisdiction of District Boards and so they were certain to lose financially on account of this proposal. He therefore felt that it was only fair that the Government should agree to grant special subventions to District Boards from State funds or from railway earnings to the extent of the loss they might sustain on this account.

Continuing, he said that Government would be perpetuating by means of the new legislation the toll-gates for the abolition of which the House was always agitating. In addition to retaining the toll-gates, the Government had proposed

heavier burdens on bullock carts while reducing the burden of taxation in certain cases in respect of fast moving vehicles. This, he thought, was an invidious distinction and it looked as though the proposed legislation aimed purposely at creating hardships to bullock carts.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that that was far from the intention of Government. They would have no objection to continuing the exemption granted in the year 1929 in respect of bullock carts, without making any fresh reservations. He added that in the event of Government taking over the district fund toll-gates, the exemption would also apply to bullock carts passing through such gates.

On behalf of himself and other members of the Assembly, MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY expressed his gratitude for this announcement.

In conclusion, the speaker hoped that the various suggestions offered by him and the previous speakers would be sympathetically viewed by the Government and that Government would agree to withdraw the Bill for the present with a view to placing before the House at its next session a more comprehensive and more welcome measure.

MR. T. ABDUL NABI KHAN said that bus-owners had been subjected to heavy taxation for a number of years past, and some time back when they represented their grievances to the Government, the appointment of a special committee to enquire into their grievances and to recommend suitable relief measures had been promised by Government. It was as a result of that promise that, like some other committees, the Todhunter Committee also was appointed. But whereas the previous committees had recommended some measures of relief to bus-owners, this particular committee had made recommendations, the sole result of which was to materially enhance the burden of taxation. It looked as though the bus-owners had blundered in having brought their grievances to the notice of the Government. They all thought that they should have been much better off under the system of taxation existing at present. For example, the provincial toll was not being paid by all buses; only some of them paid it. But the proposed annual toll of Rs. 800 was applicable to one and all of them. This certainly would work as a hardship on the bus-owners. Not only that. At present, on almost all the routes, the bus-owners had provided spare buses so that passengers might not be put to any inconvenience in case of accidents to buses on the way. If the annual toll was fixed at such a prohibitive level, no spare buses would be maintained so that in case of accidents the travelling public were sure to be inconvenienced.

Next, in support of the proposed heavy rates Government had advanced the argument that this would not cause any hardship to the bus-owners in view of the fact that as against short distances over which a majority of buses had now been licensed to ply, they would in future be free to cover very much longer distances. He did not know how this was going to act as a blessing because, speaking generally, buses were not always able to cover such long distances. The bulk of the bus-owners would prefer to undertake short distance services paying smaller levies. On account of these reasons, it was only fair that Government should reduce the annual payment from Rs. 800 to Rs. 400.

He also requested that some special concession in the case of taxation on spare buses should be shown. If this was done, he was hopeful that many more services would be opened, that Government would receive larger income from the increased number of buses and that roads in general would receive better attention.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the annual payment of Rs. 800 represented not the actual amount proposed to be charged, but only the maximum up to which the Government could go. If, however, the sense of the House was in favour of levying something less, the question would certainly come up for discussion at the select committee stage.

Continuing, MR. ABDUL NABI KHAN said that it might not be so easy for the proposed Central Board to direct traffic

in all districts from its headquarters, *viz.*, Bangalore.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that though the headquarters of the Central Board were fixed at Bangalore, the Deputy Commissioner of each district who was also the District Magistrate thereof would act in his district as a local representative of the Board, so that he could dispose of all local and minor matters.

MR. ABDUL NABI KHAN suggested that in addition to the District Magistrate, the District Superintendent of Police, the Executive Engineer and one or two non-official gentlemen should have a voice in the matter and that these gentlemen might be constituted into a sort of a sub-committee in each district.

MR. C. M. GARUDACHAR prefaced his remarks with the observation that the Todhunter Committee had not examined the question in all its aspects. In his opinion, it did not command the advantage of proper co-operation and advice from experts. No doubt, the committee had sent up questionnaires to bus-owners and obtained replies. But that was not enough. They should have also examined some bus-owners. Of course he agreed that the interests of bus-owners had not been altogether ignored, because there were one or two representatives of theirs on the committee. But unfortunately such representatives were either new to the field or had gone out of it. He would have attached greater weight to the recommendations of the committee if a due measure of representation on it had been allowed to bus-owners.

Continuing, MR. GARUDACHAR repeated the argument that the proposed taking over by the Government of the privilege to issue licences would result in a loss of income to the local bodies concerned. He was aware that with regard to the apportionment of revenues, the question would be reviewed once in every three years and any increased share due to the local bodies on account of increased income would certainly be given to them. But, in the meanwhile, on account of the actual increase in the number of motors and buses, the benefit of the increased revenue would be lost to the local bodies until such time as a fresh apportionment was made. In the next place, he said, the proposed taking over by Government of the control and management of all toll-gates would result in a definite withdrawal of the privilege of local self-government now enjoyed by the local bodies.

MR. GARUDACHAR also quoted statistics to prove that the proposed taxation was in most respects higher than what it was at present, and much more so than the taxes subsisting in Madras, Bombay and other British Indian Presidencies.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL reminded the member that the figures mentioned in the Bill represented only the maximum up to which the Government could go and therefore it would not be accurate to compare those figures with the rates prevailing anywhere.

MR. GARUDACHAR argued that once the maximum was fixed, the natural tendency would be to take full advantage of it. If really the Government proposed not to charge the maximum rates, there was no harm in reducing the figures. Personally he would suggest that the rates levied in Mysore should be lower than those in Madras or Bombay in view of the facts that the population in those places was much larger, the area covered by the buses there was wider, and the climatic and economic conditions there were such that people were obliged to resort to buses. It was also necessary for the Government to remember that bus-owners in Mysore, in addition to paying heavy tolls now imposed, were also contributing the bulk of the income derived by the Government from the petrol tax. If, in addition, the direct taxes were also enhanced, he feared that the number of services would materially fall. This, in fact, was the experience in Madras and elsewhere.

The proposed legislation did not indicate if Mysore had arrived at reciprocal arrangements with other administrations. In the absence of such arrangements, the hardship on the bus-owners would be still greater if they desired to ply their buses outside the State on any occasion. In this view it was necessary to come to reciprocal

arrangements before proposing any increase of taxes.

As already stated, the level of taxation in Madras and elsewhere was lower than that proposed in Mysore. And yet, considerable agitation was going on in those parts and a very large number of associations were carrying on the agitation with a view to secure reduction. While that was the case, the Government could easily see what amount of agitation would arise in Mysore if the proposed higher rates were really brought into effect. Apart even from the question of agitation, it was certain that a large number of services would be discontinued, as had been the experience elsewhere, and the speaker feared that the anticipations of the Government in respect of increased revenue would altogether fail.

MR. GARUDACHAR also requested the Government to bear in mind the repurcussions of the proposed enhanced taxation on other industries. For example, a number of lorries were being engaged for transporting coffee from some of the districts of the State to the west coast. Such lorries paid taxes to both Mysore and British India. If the proposed rates were levied, the lorry-owners might not be able to make any profit and therefore might refuse to run lorries; and even granting that a few services would still be open, the reduced number of services would have to take more than one trip in order to transport the produce. The coffee-growers would be able to realise satisfactory prices only if the produce reached the coast in time. If on account of the paucity of lorries such transport was belated, the coffee-growers could not be sure of securing reasonable prices.

From all these points of view, the speaker appealed to Government to withdraw the Bill so that the present bus-owners who had arrived at certain amicable understandings among themselves with regard to the running of buses, might in course of time recover their lost ground. At present, they had sunk a large capital but had incurred heavy losses. They stood in need of sympathy at the hands of the Government, and it would be graceful if Government did not insist upon carrying through the measure in the teeth of opposition.

MR. J. MAHOMED IMAM, supporting the argument advanced by the previous speaker, observed that bus-owners in general were incurring heavy losses on account of the number of taxes and tolls they had to pay and that, if heavier taxes were imposed, even the few surviving services would have to discontinue in future. This was the experience in the past in Mysore and elsewhere also. If the same thing happened in future, the progress of the State would surely be retarded. Railway facilities in the State were quite inadequate especially in the *malnad*. The little contact there was between the interior parts of the *malnad* districts and the centres of trade and commerce was sure to suffer if the bus companies discontinued their services. He did not know whether the proposed increase of taxation was due to an impression on the part of the Government that the bus-owners were making huge profits. From all accounts, it would appear that the reverse was the case. Oftentimes, buses were running empty. At any rate there was no guarantee every day each bus would get the full load of passengers. In this view, taxation on the basis of seating capacity was a proposal which reason could not support. Personally he thought that it would be much better to levy taxes on the basis of the actual income derived by the bus-owners. That was in fact the principle followed in the case of the Amusement Tax. If the same thing was done in the case of public service vehicles also, he hoped that there would be no opposition from any quarter.

Dharmapravartha M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY supported the principles of the Bill in general for the reason that bus traffic had seriously interfered with the railway income in several cases. But with regard to the details of the Bill, he suggested that pleasure cars and private lorries used for conveying agricultural produce should be altogether exempted from the proposed taxation.

MR. MAHOMED MUSTAFA SAHIB observed that the proposed taxation was very much higher than that levied in the adjoining tracts of British India and quoted figures in support of this contention. He added that the measure would cause great hardship to bus-owners, but greater hardship to the travelling public, as, in order to meet the increased taxes, the bus-owners would naturally have to increase the passenger fares. As a bus-owner himself, he was aware that on many of the roads in the Kolar District on which buses were now plying, a number of cases of theft and dacoity were happening in the past and, in addition to the usual recognised services, these buses had also served the public in indirectly helping to put an end to such cases. If in view of the enhanced taxation buses ceased to ply on such roads, it was certain that thefts would again begin to occur frequently.

Secondly, most of the bus-owners had provided spare buses so far. In future, on account of the heavy taxes imposed, it would not be possible for them to keep any spares. If so, whenever accidents occurred, the travelling public were sure to be seriously inconvenienced. In all these directions, the proposed measure would cause serious inconvenience to public interests. For these reasons he opposed the general principles of the measure.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR observed that the level of taxation even at present was very high and if it was further raised, the brunt of the burden would devolve upon the travelling public. Whether they were able to bear that burden was a question for Government to consider with due regard to the present economic depression.

The bus-owners, he said, were not making any profits from the services. On the other hand, many of them had been ruined on account of various reasons and the few surviving services could not be expected to yield the large profits that Government seemed to be expecting as a result of the proposed legislation. Secondly, the bus-owners seemed to be the only class of people who, in addition to paying income-tax, were expected to pay very heavy taxes with reference to their income. The lawyers, the businessmen and others were not subject to such a double taxation and in the interests of justice, fairness and equity, Government would do well to consider several times before determining to go ahead with the measure.

The objection from bus-owners was not only with reference to the heavy taxation proposed but also to the continuance of the toll-gates to which all classes of people were always opposed. Some of the British Indian administrations had realised that it would not be fair to keep toll-gates and that was why they had abolished toll-gates and introduced Motor Vehicles Acts. In the neighbouring Presidency of Madras also, tolls had been abolished and even though the Government subsequently realised that they need not have done so, yet on considerations of prestige at least they had made up their minds not to revert to the old practice. Such being the case, he did not know why the Mysore Government was so very particular about keeping on toll-gates and also levying from motor bus-owners taxes at such heavy rates.

Continuing, MR. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR said that a perusal of the detailed provisions of the Bill showed that buses would be hit harder than taxis so that in course of time taxis were sure to become a source of keenest competition with the buses. That was already the case in the Mysore District and if such a position arose throughout the State, the bus traffic would suffer very much. Instead of proposing such unreasonably high rates with regard to buses, he thought that Government would have done well to propose heavier taxation on taxis and also pleasure cars. He was willing to concede that Government stood in need of adequate revenues in order to maintain roads in a fit condition. So far, he hoped that the House would be one with the Government. But the difference of opinion was only with regard to the details of the Bill. He for one would have been very pleased to suggest ways and means of obtaining

increased revenues, but unfortunately he was unable to do so because the Bill itself had not been placed in his hands. It was also unfortunate that the members of the Assembly were not able to know in detail the recommendations of the Todhunter Committee. Even now if these two things were furnished to the House and the consideration of the Bill was deferred till the next session of the Assembly, he thought it would be possible for the members to consider the whole question carefully and make useful suggestions.

MR. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR then said that another purpose would be served by the Government agreeing to postpone the consideration of the Bill. At present, the income from toll-gates was an important source of income to the District Boards from which they were able to do the little useful work they were doing. If this source of income was taken away as a result of the toll-gates being controlled by the Central Traffic Board the entire system of Local Self-Government in the State would suffer a severe set-back. The proposed legislation would thus amount to a virtual withdrawal of the privilege of local self-government at present enjoyed by the local bodies in the State. Also, the district boards and the municipalities which were so vitally concerned in the matter had not been given any opportunity of expressing opinions with regard to the proposed measure. It would be very unfair, he thought, to decide finally the various issues that were bound to come up in this connection without giving them such an opportunity. This could not be done unless the Government agreed to defer the consideration of the Bill for the present.

MR. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR also referred to the desirability of exempting private lorries used for agricultural purposes and transporting agricultural produce from payment of tolls, just as bullock carts used for such purposes were so exempted.

With regard to railway competition roads, the member brought to notice that the mileage cess was so heavy that no single bus-owner was prepared to take up any service for the whole road in any case. Government might say that services on railway competition roads were being run at present, but they might not be aware of the fact that two or more persons were running them, dividing the route into two or more sections. Thus, the burden of the heavy taxation was being distributed among all the concerned contractors. Under the proposed legislation, the Government had proposed to give the monopoly over such routes to the State Railways. If so, private bus-owners would be denied the opportunity of carrying on the services on such routes and making some profits. This attitude of the Government clearly showed that they were inclined to favour monopolistic tendencies. He did not know how far this attitude would be consistent with the oft-repeated expressions of solicitude on the part of the Government for cottage and other smaller industries.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY suggested that Government might, in view of the different opinions expressed by the members of the House, kindly agree to consider the whole question afresh and place a revised Bill before the House at its next session.

MR. B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR of Anekal observed that particularly in Mysore short distance services were serving as feeders to railways and as such deserved greater sympathy at the hands of the Government than those in British India where long distance services were serving this purpose better. He also suggested that the several District Boards should be represented on the Central Traffic Board.

On behalf of the Government, the FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that Government fully recognised the great contribution made by the motor bus services towards the progress of the State. They had established contact between the several parts of the State and enabled the people from the interior to resort to the cities and, in addition to transacting their own business, to see the several improvements effected in the cities and to effect similar improvements in their own

tracts. As had been pointed out by one of the previous speakers, the bus services had helped in putting an end to highway robbery and it had been possible for Government to reduce to some extent the police force maintained by them. Such being the case, Government could have no wish to discourage them. If it was asked why the Government were proposing to constitute a Central Board to take under their control all the bus services in the State, the only answer was that bus-owners if left without some such control would resort to unrestricted competition and not only be ruining themselves but also cause serious inconveniences to the travelling public. This, he said, was a position that Government could no longer countenance and in the interests of the bus-owners themselves it had become the duty of the Government effectively to control them so that the services could be maintained at a high level of efficiency at least in future. This in fact was the main object of the Bill under discussion. The principle of one central authority controlling transport had been recognised by all progressive administrations in the West. In fact, they had gone further than what Mysore was proposing to do at present, because while the Central Board in Mysore would confine its attention to bus traffic only, the transport ministries in the West had under their control all forms of transport.

Continuing, the MEMBER OF COUNCIL sympathised with the desire expressed by members of district boards and muncipalities to have these bodies duly represented on the Central Traffic Board, but he feared that if that suggestion was acted upon, the Board would become an altogether unwieldy body. Government, however, were going to see that all the important interests concerned would be properly represented on that Board. There would be nothing to prevent the Central Traffic Board from consulting any interests that might not be so represented There was no need for any apprehension that opinions of either the local bodies or of other interests would go uncared for by the Board.

Objection had been taken by some of the speakers to the rates of toll proposed in the Bill. In this connection the FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL reminded the House that at present, under the Chief Commissioner's Notification which had still the force of law, Government had unlimited powers with regard to the rates of tolls to be charged. By laying down in the proposed law the maximum rates of taxation they should have on the statute book a comprehensive and self-contained law and the public might be certain that the Government could not go beyond the stipulated rates. The members must remember that the figures mentioned in the schedule were after all the maxima beyond which Government could not go.

One of the speakers had observed that it might not be possible for the Central Board with head-quarters at Bangalore to conduct the operations throughout the State. To that he had already given the reply that the Deputy Commissioners would carry on the routine duties of the Board as its local representatives, major questions alone having to go up to the Central Board. If such an arrangement was not brought about, the present unsatisfactory system with regard to rates would continue to exist in the future also.

Many members had pleaded that country carts used for agricultural purposes which were proposed to be taxed under the revised law should continue to enjoy exemption. Government would accede to that request. The existing exemtions would be continued.

Particular reference had been made by some of the previous speakers to the hardship that might be caused to owners of public service vehicles by levying the rates of taxes proposed in the Bill. On a further consideration of that question, Government would be willing to reduce the quarterly tax on vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres and licensed to carry more than four persons to Rs. 7-8-0 as against the maximum of Rs. 10 provided in the schedule. This would bring the level of taxation in respect of such vehicles into line with that prevailing in Madras.

Reference had been made by some of the speakers to the desirability of establishing reciprocity with other administrations. The question had already been taken up by Government and it was hoped that, very soon, satisfactory arrangements would be arrived at in that respect.

Government would also be glad to consider the other suggestions made by the members such as showing some special concession in the case of spare buses maintained by public service contractors in the interests of traffic.

In conclusion, the FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL hoped that the House would realise that, on the whole, the proposed legislation would result in better arrangements in future and that in this view, it would accept the general principles of the Bill.

The general principles of the Bill were then put to vote and *lost*, by an over-whelming majority.

At this stage, the House adjourned for lunch and met again at 3-40 p.m.

II. Statement of General Principles of the Bill to amend the Mysore Co-operative Societies Regulation, 1918.

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

Special provisions relating to Co-operative Land Mortgage Banks were added by Regulation V of 1929 to the Mysore Co-operative Societies Regulation, 1918.

The working of the banks during the last four years has disclosed that the existing provisions are inadequate for the successful working of the mortgage banks. The question of adequate powers for the speedy recovery of arrears from defaulters is of fundamental importance. The Mysore Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank, Bangalore, has urged the desirability of adding to the existing provisions in the Co-operative Societies Regulation certain provisions introduced in Madras by the Land Mortgage Banks Act, X of 1934, relating to the powers and the administration of the banks.

The main changes proposed to be introduced are as follows :—

1. In case of default in payment of instalments due, the Registrar will be empowered on the application of the mortgage bank to distrain the produce of the mortgaged land including the standing crops thereon under appropriate safeguards and to bring them to sale.

2. Where the mortgaged property is wholly or partially destroyed or the security is rendered insufficient, the bank will have the right to demand further security or to proceed to distrain and sell the produce of the mortgaged land.

3. Where a primary bank fails to take action against a defaulter, the Board of the Central Mortgage Bank or the Registrar may take the necessary action.

4. It is considered desirable to prevent the mortgagor from leasing the mortgaged property for a period longer than five years.

5. Provision is made for safeguarding the interests of mortgage banks by preventing mortgages executed in favour of the bank from being called into question in insolvency proceedings and by securing priority to a mortgage debt in favour of a mortgage bank over any claim of the Government arising from a loan under the Land Improvement Loans Regulation granted after the execution of the mortgage.

6. The mortgage bank will be given the right to require a prior creditor of the mortgagor to receive payment, and in case of refusal interest will cease to run.

7. Registration of documents executed on behalf of a mortgage bank will be permitted without the appearance in person before the Sub-Registrar of any officer of the bank.

8. The burden of proving that a mortgage executed by the manager of a joint Hindu family is not binding on the members thereof shall lie on the party raising it.

9. Sections 52, 53 and 54 of the Mysore Co-operative Societies Regulation, as they now stand, make it

obligatory on the part of Government to sanction the bye-laws of primary land mortgage societies and the amendments that may be passed from time to time. It is proposed to make this requirement of Government sanction applicable only to the Central Land Mortgage Banks.

The Bill is intended to give effect to these changes.

MR. V. V. IYER supported the general principles of the proposed Bill except in respect of the proposals to empower the land mortgage bank to demand further security referred to in item No 2 under the main changes.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO expressed himself against items Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 8 under the proposed changes. With regard to item No. 4, he thought that the effect of the proposed change would be to deny the mortgagor the privilege of exercising his full rights of ownership of his property.

With regard to item No. 5, he said that it was usual for courts of law not to recognise any encumbrance created within three months immediately preceding the date of application for declaration of insolvency, the guiding principle being a presumption that the applicant had created the encumbrance with the avowed object of deceiving his creditors. The seeking to prevent mortgages in favour of the bank from being questioned in insolvency proceedings and the securing of priority to a mortgage debt in favour of the bank over any claims arising from loans under the Land Improvement Loans Regulation were sure to come in the way of a rateable distribution which all other creditors had a right to expect. These were steps which he thought would be most unreasonable. He also thought that the privilege proposed to be given to the bank to require a prior creditor of the mortgagor to receive payment and if he did not receive it, to refuse interest, was equally unfair to the creditor.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that so long as the main object was to help the indebted agriculturists, such small sacrifices on the part of creditors would become a necessary duty.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO however thought that as most of the creditors happened to be small money-lenders, it would be unfair to make them forego their interest earnings. But this was not such a great hardship as would result from insisting that they should take back the loan amount whenever the bank preferred. It might be that the lender would have adjusted his affairs; it might be, in some cases at least, payment in advance would cause some inconvenience to him and dislocate his financial adjustments. The special facilities already afforded to the agriculturists under the Agriculturists' Relief Regulation appeared to him quite sufficient. He did not know why in connection with this legislation Government wanted to go farther than in the case of the Agriculturists' Relief Regulation in which Government had given due consideration to the question of safeguarding the interests of the creditors and the agriculturists also.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that there was no intention on the part of Government to confiscate for the land mortgage bank all the rights of the creditors. In fact the scheme had always favoured the securing of the creditor's money for him. But these provisions were necessary if the land mortgage bank scheme should have a chance of saving the indebted agriculturists.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO observed that the advantage of the proposed legislation was all on one side, *viz.*, on the side of the agriculturists. The small investors also were subjects of the State equally with the indebted agriculturists, and it was not fair that one was made to suffer on account of the other. After all, these money-lenders made very small profits by way of interest receipts and the very nature of their business required that they must go on lending and borrowing in proper time so that in each case the duration of the full term mentioned in the bond was an important factor from the standpoint of the money-lenders.

With regard to the proposal that the burden of proving that a mortgage executed by the manager of a joint Hindu family was not binding on the members

of such family should in future lie on the party raising the issue instead of on the creditor as heretofore, MR. NARASINGA RAO thought that it was unfair and quite uncalled for in the sense that it sought seriously to interfere with the rights as recognised by Hindu Law.

In conclusion, he thought that this was a measure affecting vested rights and it was necessary for the House to know what the complete Bill was going to be in all its details. As the entire Bill had not been placed before the House, it was not possible for it to give its support on the strength of the incomplete information available at present. For these reasons he opposed the principles of the measure.

MR. M. A. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR, in supporting the general principles of the measure, said that similar provisions had been made in all western countries where land mortgage banks had been opened. It was necessary to see on the one hand that the funds of the land mortgage banks which were raised in the form of debentures were secured and on the other that the agriculturists, for any reason, were not prevented from enjoying the full benefits of the land mortgage bank scheme. At the same time, he feared that the Bill as proposed did not seem to provide for all questions connected with the removal of indebtedness in which land mortgage banks as well as other co-operative institutions were deeply interested. The proposed measure, he thought, was in this sense a piecemeal legislation and such legislation did not often serve a very useful purpose.

With regard to the details of the Bill, he thought that the indebted raiyat would be hit very hard by the first of the main changes proposed, if unfortunately he committed even one default in respect of payment of instalments. In such cases, the Registrar was proposed to be empowered not only to recall the entire loan but to order distraint of the produce of the mortgaged land including the standing crops. This, he said, was sure to work as a very great hardship on the raiyat and the provision in this respect could well be relaxed more especially in view of the heavy rate of penal interest that could be charged in all such cases.

This led the speaker on to the general question of the rates of interest charged by land mortgage banks in Mysore. The rates charged in Mysore were higher than those in Madras and elsewhere. The debentures raised in Mysore carried a much lower rate of interest than those raised in Madras, and there was no justification to charge higher rates of interest in Mysore than those prevailing in Madras.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL agreed that as money was raised cheaper, the land mortgage bank should levy lower rates of interest in future. But this, he observed, did not seem to have any direct bearing on the measure under discussion.

MR. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR agreed that it had no direct bearing on the measure under discussion. But he said that he advisedly raised the question to show that while the Government were proposing relief to one of the parties interested in the working of the land mortgage banks, they had not done equal justice by the others who were equally concerned, namely the creditors. In this sense the legislation proposed was piecemeal and he would like to have it improved so as to be a self-contained measure.

Certain important aspects had been lost sight of in the proposed measure, such, for example, as the maximum rates of interest at which debentures should be raised by the bank and the maximum rates leviable from the borrowers. In the Federal legislation in force in the United States of America, restrictions in both these respects had been imposed. Even in Mysore, the Apex Bank stipulated restrictions with regard to the maximum rates of interest that could be levied from the borrowers. But in the case of the land mortgage bank there appeared to be no such restrictions. It was desirable to make the law specific on these points.

The proposed law did not seem to have taken into consideration several questions connected even with the grant of relief to the indebted agriculturists. For example, it was not laid down that

the number of instalments should be fixed in each case with reference to the earning capacity of the raiyat. This question had engaged the attention of the All-India Registrars' Conference recently and a resolution had been recorded by that Conference to the effect that the period of repayment should be raised to 40 years in the interests of the raiyats. Another resolution passed by that Conference related to the lowering of the rate of interest, and a third resolution suggested that whenever loans were granted, the institutions granting them must try to clear off the previous debts of the borrowers, as otherwise it might be difficult for them to satisfy their other creditors. Thus, some systematic planning was necessary both in regard to legislation relating to land mortgage bank and in regard to the working of the bank itself. Otherwise, the land mortgage bank would only become another co-operative institution granting loans on imperfect data with only an off-chance of recovering them when and where possible.

Proceeding, the speaker explained that there was another important circumstance to be considered in connection with the proposed legislation. Section 19 of the Co-operative Societies Regulation gave priority of claim to lending societies if the loans were granted for agricultural purposes. If, under the proposed measure, priority of claim was secured for the land mortgage bank, it would be inconsistent with the Co-operative Societies Regulation, and *bona fide* disputes might arise as between the one and the other which it might be difficult even for the Registrar to decide. In order to prevent such a conflict of interests, it was best that the law itself provided for a reconciliation between the two types of institutions.

This was not the only issue in respect of which there might be a conflict of interest between co-operative institutions and land mortgage banks. In Madras, for example, the scheme definitely prohibited the grant of loans even for agricultural purposes of an original nature. In Mysore however the law provided for the grant of such loans and though they were not actually being granted, he had been informed that at the present time certain applications for the grant of such loans had been received by the land mortgage bank. If these were sanctioned, it was likely that in course of time a clash would arise between the two types of institutions. It did not appear to him that even the Central Banking Enquiry Committee had bestowed sufficient thought on that question. However, he thought it would be well if the law in Mysore provided for dealing with cases of that nature.

Continuing, the speaker observed that there was inconsistency as between two of the proposed changes, *viz.*, Nos. 4 and 6. In one case, it was proposed to prevent the mortgagor from leasing the mortgaged property for more than 5 years. This, he said, was really desirable. But, in the other case, the mortgage bank would be enabled to call upon a prior creditor to receive payment and, in case he did not receive it, to refuse interest. If, as was generally the case, the leasehold interest belonged to the creditor, how could the land mortgage bank distrain the crop, as provided for in item No. 1? If it could not do so, what was it that it should attach for recovering the loans?

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the bank might proceed on the lessee's share.

MR. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR replied that by executing a lease deed any one could make that impossible.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that in such a case the *gutha* itself might be attached.

MR. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR thought that that could be done not under the provision for distraint and sale of produce but under some other provision.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that this provision would apply to those cases in which it was possible to distrain the produce.

MR. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR suggested that it was better that the two provisions under reference were so improved as not to be mutually inconsistent.

In conclusion, the member requested

the Registrar and the Government to see that sanction was accorded to the resolution recently passed by the Co-operative Conference to the effect that a central co-operative enquiry committee be constituted in Mysore and to refer the proposed measure to it as soon as it was brought into existence. In this view, he requested the Government not to go ahead with the proposed measure, but to place it again before the House at a subsequent session with the opinions and suggestions of the central body referred to.

MR. P. SITHARAMIAH supported the proposed measure in general. But he also said that certain provisions seemed to require reconsideration and certain matters not dealt with in the measure required to be provided for. At the outset he suggested that some special concessions be included with regard to co-operative societies which were also advancing loans on the security of immovable properties. He thought that a specific provision should be made that in the course of the steps taken for the recovery of outstandings from the mortgagees, the land mortgage bank could attach standing crops. Otherwise, as pointed out by the previous speaker, a conflict of interests might arise as between the bank and other co-operative institutions. He was aware that there might be cases in which the debtors might nominally transfer the lease but continue to be in possession of the land. In such cases, he would suggest that a specific provision be made to the effect that the lessee might attach whatever interest the debtor actually had in the property.

The member gave his unqualified support to item No. 4 of the main changes proposed, but he went further and said that within the period of 5 years specified in it, the debtor must obtain special permission from the land mortgage bank to the transferring of any interest to others.

Item No. 5 appeared to him unnecessary and improper.

Similarly item No. 8 was also open to objection. He thought that the proper thing to do was to make full enquiries, before granting loans, to see that the loans were taken for *bona fide* purposes. But neither the Government nor the legislature should aim at interfering with the substantive provisions of the Hindu Law in respect of such vital points. If that was done, many interests might suffer. By creating a presumption in favour of the bank, as proposed, the rights of the minor members of the joint family would be interfered with, which could never be justified. As in the case of all other loans, the burden of proving that the loans falling under this legislation were taken for *bona fide* purposes must continue to devolve upon the creditors concerned. The object underlying this proposal could as well be served, he thought, by making the minor members regular parties to the transaction and taking their signatures, or by taking their attestation as witnesses to the bonds. If the Government would agree to effect these modifications and bring up an improved Bill, he hoped it would receive unanimous support.

MR. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR said that, under the Civil Procedure Code, no creditor had power to attach standing crops even if the concerned lands had been offered as security. But by the proposed measure not only would this time-honoured privilege of agriculturists be superseded but also the land mortgage bank would be acquiring a special claim which no other creditor could. He thought there was no justification for such a drastic modification of the existing law.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the proposed amendment was helpful to the debtor himself. In case of default on his part, the land mortgage bank would be at perfect liberty, under the rules, to call back the entire loan. If this provision was fully availed of by the creditor-bank, it would be the debtor who would stand to suffer. So, attaching the crop was the best way of recovering its dues without jeopardising the permanent interests of the raiyat. Secondly, it was necessary to remember that the land mortgage bank derived its funds in the shape of debentures and the bank owed a responsibility to the debenture-holders, *viz.*, to see that none of its funds were lost.

MR. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR agreed with Mr. Sitharamiah that the burden of proof referred to in item No. 8 should continue to devolve on the creditor as in the case of all other loans. In conclusion, he said that he was not aware whether public opinion throughout the State had been consulted on the proposed measure which seemed to make very drastic changes in the Hindu Law as existing at present. Personally he was not inclined to support the measure.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO appealed to the House to remember that the land mortgage bank scheme had to be inaugurated under extraordinary circumstances and therefore it needed an especial measure of support. The agriculturist was at the present time in a most deplorable economic condition and the land mortgage bank alone could give him the required assistance in respect of both the rates of interest and the number of instalments. As was pointed out by a previous speaker, the funds of this bank were drawn from debentures and unless everything was done to ensure prompt recoveries, the very stability of such a useful institution would be jeopardised. This, in fact, had been the experience in many other countries. The dangers to which the agriculturists would be exposed if the provision in respect of enabling the land mortgage bank to distrain the produce of the mortgaged land was not made, had been fully explained by the First Member of Council. If the entire loan was recalled, the raiyat would be unable to pay it and therefore the land itself would be lost to him. Instead of availing itself of this provision, the land mortgage bank would certainly be glad to attach the crop so that by selling it it would get back just the overdue instalments. If there was a surplus it would certainly hand it to the debtor. It was also necessary to remember that in such a case the ownership of the land which the debtor had would continue undisturbed. After all, merely because there was a provision to this effect, it need not be apprehended that the land mortgage bank would apply it indiscriminately in all cases. Just as the revenue officers were empowered to take coercive measures for the recovery of even the first few *khists* of land revenue and just as this power was not really exercised by them indiscriminately, the bank also would not exercise it in all cases.

With regard to item No. 8, the speaker no doubt agreed that it would interfere with the rights recognised under the Hindu Law in the case of members of a joint family. But, this being an extraordinary measure, a provision like the one proposed was necessary at least for some time. If this provision proved in actual working to be undesirable, there was nothing to prevent people from representing to Government that the same should be modified. He did not also see any great difficulty either in expecting the members of the joint family to prove that a particular loan was not obtained by the manager for *bona fide* purposes. In conclusion, the member suggested that in the case of the *malnad* particularly, the repayment of instalments should be spread over a much longer period than was proposed in the measure. Even in the case of private loans on the security of landed property, no money-lender in the *malnad* generally agreed to lend unless the lease was so long as to enable him to grow such crops on it as he liked. In this view the period of repayment in that part of the State should be longer than in the *maidan*.

MR. A. VENKATESAIYA spoke in agreement with the proposed measure.

With regard to item No. 6, relating to the power to be given to the land mortgage bank of requiring a prior creditor to receive payment, the speaker feared that this might act prejudicially to the interests of the debtor. Generally speaking, a party applying to the land mortgage bank for help would be one who would have already exhausted his credit everywhere else. In the case of such a man, it would not be an unreasonable presumption that he would have gone on renewing pro-notes every time the creditor demanded payment. In such cases, the amount of the revised bond would invariably include not only the principal but also the interest up-to-date, so that after a

number of renewals the total amount due would be the original principal *plus* a very large amount in the shape of ordinary interest or even compound interest. If the default continued for long, normally the creditor would go to a competent court and in the course of such a civil litigation the debtor would have an opportunity to prove that the full amount claimed was not really due. In such cases, in view of the Agriculturists' Relief Regulation, the courts would pass a decree not for the full amount claimed but only for the principal *plus* a small amount on account of interest In such cases, the debtor always stood to gain. Under the proposed measure however, the land mortgage bank itself would take the initiative and call upon the creditors to accept payment. In such an event the full amount of the loan together with interest up-to-date would have to be paid and so the debtor would pay much more than what he would have to if the creditor had instituted civil proceedings and obtained a decree.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the land mortgage bank was not going to pay any and every one of the prior creditors but would do so only in cases where payment would go to lighten the burden of the debtor.

MR. VENKATESAIYA then referred to another point. It was possible that in connection with a prior encumbrance a money-lender might obtain from a competent civil court a decree against the debtor and attach the crop in the course of execution. If the debtor happened to have subsequently obtained a loan from the land mortgage bank on the security of the same land and committed default, the land mortgage bank also would attach the crop standing on it under the orders of the Registrar's Court. In such a case, he thought many issues might arise : for example, which was the superior court and which the inferior and which of the two attachments should get priority ? Would both of them have to be satisfied simultaneously and if so, how ? Was there going to be a rateable distribution ? It would be desirable, he said, to settle all such issues in advance.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that this question would be looked into at the select committee stage.

Lastly, MR. VENKATESAIYA referred to item No. 5 in which priority was sought to be established in respect of the interests of the land mortgage bank over every other sort of claim in respect of the secured property including claims advanced by opponents in insolvency proceedings. The latest Privy Council decisions in respect of insolvency proceedings had laid down that the burden of proof should lie on the receivers and not upon the creditors. How the proposed measure would be consistent with such decisions was a point which the legislature would do well to consider.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that this was a matter of detail which could be gone into later on so long as the principle of securing the interests of the land mortgage bank in such cases was conceded.

MESSRS. BALE GOWDA and VEMA REDDY also spoke in support of the proposed measure. MR. BALE GOWDA added that wherever land mortgage banks existed, respectable gentlemen should be appointed as Presidents and the banks empowered to give in deserving cases smaller loans than were provided for at present. Personally he would suggest Rs. 100 as the minimum.

With regard to the objection from certain members that the proposed measure would have the effect of interfering with the Hindu Law in certain respects, MR. K T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR observed that the object of the Hindu Law throwing the burden of proof on the creditor in cases of debts contracted by the manager of a joint Hindu family was to ensure against the manager conspiring with the creditor to jeopardise the interests of the minor children. In the case of a land mortgage bank, however, which would naturally consist of a number of respectable persons and which was a public institution, there was no scope for any apprehension and therefore the special provision proposed was

necessary. Item No. 8 of the proposed measure to which some members were opposed was thus a very desirable provision and he would therefore lend his unqualified support to it.

Even with regard to the other provisions of the measure, he was inclined to support them generally but there were certain points which he thought should have been made more clear. For example, it was not clear what exactly were the appropriate safeguards referred to in item No. 1 of the main changes. It was necessary that Government should make all these points clear in the Bill itself. In fact, he said, the House would have appreciated very much if the Government had placed the entire Bill in the hands of the members.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL in finally replying to the debate observed that Messrs. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao and Bhashyam Aiyangar had clearly referred to the more important advantages that would result from the proposed legislation, and so, not much was left for him to add. The basic principle of the proposed legislation being to help the indebted agriculturists as against creditors, it was needless to emphasise that small inconveniences that might possibly be caused to others by the proposed legislation should naturally assume minor importance.

Objection was taken by some of the previous speakers to the proposal empowering the land mortgage bank to distrain crops. His only answer to them was that the exercise of such a power by the bank would be a blessing to the debtor for, if that power was not given the only way open to the bank to recover the outstandings would be to recall the entire loan. This would certainly work as a great hardship on the debtors. But, on the other hand, by distraining the produce the bank would not be interfering with the privilege of the debtor of enjoying the ownership of the land.

Objection had also been taken by some members to the proposal to empower the bank to demand further security. This power was proposed to be given merely to enable the bank to secure the interests of the debenture-holders. Otherwise, whenever the bank felt that the security once offered was deteriorating, it would be the duty of the bank immediately to recall the entire loan, and if its repayment was insisted upon, the debtor would surely be ruined. Thus, this provision really meant to help the raiyat.

With regard to the desirability or otherwise of throwing the burden of proof on the minor members of a joint Hindu family, instead of on the creditors, Government shared the opinions expressed by Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar.

Continuing, the FIRST MEMBER explained that Government sympathised with some of the other suggestions made by certain speakers, namely: (1) grant of concessions to other co-operative societies rendering aid to agriculturists, (2) the lowering of the minimum amount of loans to agriculturists, and (3) reduction of rates of interest, etc.; and Government would certainly consider them all in course of time.

On the whole, he was glad to find that the House was in favour of the measure.

The general principles of the Bill were thereupon put to vote and *passed.*

The House then adjourned to meet again at 12 of the clock the next day.

FOURTH DAY.

Tuesday, 23rd October 1934.

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.—*contd.*

Revenue Demand, Collection and Balance of Maddhikayachamanahalli (Krishnarajapet Taluk).

MR. S. K. SIDDE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk).—

Q.—10. Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(*a*) What was the *Jamabandi* of Maddhikayachamanahalli (Krishnarajpet Taluk) in the years 1932-33 and 1933-34?